

DTIC FILE COPY

2

AD-A223 599

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

STUDY PROJECT

MENTORING: A USEFUL CONCEPT FOR
LEADER DEVELOPMENT IN THE ARMY?

BY

COLONEL GAIL W. WOOD, AV

DTIC
ELECTE
JUN 29 1990

S E D

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public
release; distribution is unlimited.

11 APRIL 1990



U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

00 00 00 00

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Mentoring: A Useful Concept for Leader Development in the Army?		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Study Project
7. AUTHOR(s) COL Gail W. Wood		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army War College Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Same		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		12. REPORT DATE 89
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES April 1990
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		16. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		

Mentoring became part of the Army's lexicon in 1985, when the Chief of Staff of the Army, General John C. Wickham, Jr., challenged every leader to be a mentor to his or her subordinates. Mentoring soon emerged as a primary concept in the doctrine for professional development of the Army's future leaders. The phenomenon of mentoring was not clearly conceptualized, and as a methodology for the development of leaders it is a poorly understood concept. This paper attempts to gain an insight into the mentoring process by analyzing the perspectives of military professionals and civilian academicians. A "traditional" concept of mentoring, supported by both military and civilian perspectives, is the basis for an analysis of two generally accepted, successful mentor-protégé relationships to establish its utility. This "traditional" concept is then compared with mentoring as it is currently being practiced, as revealed in recent studies on mentoring in the military. The study concludes that mentoring means one thing to some and something else to others. The functions of coaching, role modeling, sponsoring, and related activities currently being practiced are not mentoring. They are only some of the many functions practiced by mentors. Therefore, although the concept of mentoring is valuable from an academic perspective, it has limited value to the Army as doctrine for professional development of leaders and should be eliminated from the Army's lexicon.

USAWC MILITARY STUDIES PROGRAM PAPER

**MENTORING: A USEFUL CONCEPT FOR
LEADER DEVELOPMENT IN THE ARMY?**

AN INDIVIDUAL STUDY PROJECT

by

Colonel Gail W. Wood, AV

**Lieutenant Colonel Martin W. Andresen
Project Adviser**

**U.S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013
11 April 1990**

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public
release; distribution is unlimited.**

**The views expressed in this paper are those of the
author and do not necessarily reflect the views of
the Department of Defense or any of its agencies.
This document may not be released for open publication
until it has been cleared by the appropriate military
service or government agency.**

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Gail W. Wood, COL, AV

TITLE: Mentoring: A Useful Concept for Leader Development in the Army?

FORMAT: Individual Study Project

DATE: 11 April 1990 PAGES: 84 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

▷ Mentoring became part of the Army's lexicon in 1985, when the Chief of Staff of the Army, General John C. Wickham, Jr., challenged every leader to be a mentor to his or her subordinates. Mentoring soon emerged as a primary concept in the doctrine for professional development of the Army's future leaders. The phenomenon of mentoring was not clearly conceptualized, and as a methodology for the development of leaders it is a poorly understood concept. This paper attempts to gain an insight into the mentoring process by analyzing the perspectives of military professionals and civilian academicians. A "traditional" concept of mentoring, supported by both military and civilian perspectives, is the basis for an analysis of two generally accepted, successful mentor-protege relationships to establish its utility. This "traditional" concept is then compared with mentoring as it is currently being practiced, as revealed in recent studies on mentoring in the military. The study concludes that mentoring means one thing to some and something else to others. The functions of coaching, role modeling, sponsoring, and related activities currently being practiced are not mentoring. They are only some of the many functions practiced by mentors. Therefore, although the concept of mentoring is valuable from an academic perspective, it has limited value to the Army as doctrine for professional development of leaders and should be eliminated from the Army's lexicon. (SDW) ✓

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose	1
Background	1
Organization of the Paper	2
Endnotes	4
II. THE MILITARY PERSPECTIVE ON MENTORING	5
Army Publications	5
Military Professional's Views on Mentoring	6
Mentorship Training in Professional Military Education	12
Endnotes	14
III. THE CIVILIAN PERSPECTIVE ON MENTORING	16
Characteristics of the Mentor	16
Roles of the Mentor	19
Effects of Mentoring on the Mentor and the Protege	25
Advantages of Mentoring for the Mentor	25
Advantages of Mentoring for the Protege	26
Disadvantages of Mentoring for the Mentor	27
Disadvantages of Mentoring for the Protege	28
Acquiring a Mentor	29
Difference Between Mentoring Relationships and Other Relationships	31
Cross-Gender Mentor-Protege Relationships	32
Endnotes	34

IV.	THE "TRADITIONAL" CONCEPT OF MENTORING . . .	38
	Mentorship Functions	38
	Mentorship Phases	42
	Endnotes	45
V.	APPLICATION OF THE "TRADITIONAL" CONCEPT TO TWO HISTORICAL EXAMPLES OF MENTORSHIP . . .	46
	Mentorship Comparison	46
	Mentorship Phases	47
	Initiation Phase	47
	Cultivation Phase	48
	Separation Phase	49
	Redefinition Phase	49
	Career Functions	50
	Sponsorship	50
	Exposure and Visibility	52
	Coaching	53
	Protection	53
	Challenging Assignments	54
	Psychosocial Functions	55
	Role Modeling	55
	Acceptance and Confirmation	56
	Counseling	57
	Friendship	58
	Endnotes	60
VI.	MILITARY STUDIES ON MENTORING	62
	<u>Uecker, Mentoring and Leadership</u> <u>Development in the Officers Corps</u> <u>of the USAF</u>	62
	<u>Lewandowski, Air Force Mentoring:</u> <u>The Mentor's Perspective</u>	63
	<u>Gouge, Air Force Mentoring: The</u> <u>Potential Protege's Perspective</u>	63
	<u>The Professional Development of</u> <u>Officer's Study</u>	64
	<u>Stewart and Hicks, Leader Development</u> <u>Training Assessment of U.S. Army</u> <u>Training and Doctrine Command</u> <u>(TRADOC) Brigade Commanders</u>	66
	<u>Mason, Mentoring: Its Effect On</u> <u>on Black Officers' Career</u> <u>Progression Within the US Army</u>	67

	<u>1988 Survey: Longitudinal</u>	
	<u>Research on Officer Careers</u>	69
	Endnotes	71
VII.	SUMMARY	73
	Findings	73
	Conclusion	75
	Recommendations	76
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	78

MENTORING: A USEFUL CONCEPT FOR LEADER DEVELOPMENT IN THE ARMY?

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

The purpose of this paper is to present a useful, comprehensive definition of mentoring, to look at how mentoring is currently being practiced throughout the Army, and to determine if mentoring should remain in the Army's lexicon. Or, should it be eliminated in favor of terms which more accurately describe how the Army develops its future leaders?

BACKGROUND

In 1985 the Chief of Staff of the Army, General John C. Wickham, Jr., published a "White Paper" which designated "Leadership" as that year's Army theme. In that paper he addressed eight precepts for a framework designed to produce more effective Army leaders. The first of those precepts challenged every leader to be a mentor to his or her subordinates.¹ As a result, mentoring immediately became part of the Army's lexicon.

Mentoring quickly emerged as a primary concept in all leadership courses throughout the Army's professional education

system.² Most officers included "mentoring of subordinates" as a major objective on their Officer Evaluation Support Form, a document which outlines the goals an officer plans to achieve during his current job.³ The term "mentoring" began to appear in official Army publications concerning leadership.

The Chief of Staff of the Army thus had quickly generated tremendous support for the concept of mentoring. The problem was that the Army had not formulated an official definition of mentoring nor had it established any guidelines for instituting a mentoring program.⁴

This lack of a widely accepted, clear definition of mentoring and the absence of an approved mentoring program created a void in policy. It caused much ambiguity and was the genesis of many different interpretations of mentoring and diverse ideas about how to implement a mentoring program. Consequently, mentoring came to mean different things to different people, causing considerable misunderstanding in communication concerning the subject.

ORGANIZATION OF THE PAPER

Following this overview, Chapter II will review the relevant military literature on mentoring, thereby providing a military perspective on the concept.

Likewise, Chapter III will review the civilian literature on mentoring. It will bring together a broad spectrum of ideas,

theories and opinions concerning mentoring from the academic community.

Chapter IV then presents a "traditional" concept of mentoring that appears to best define the practice of mentoring incorporating both the military and civilian perspectives.

Chapter V provides an historical analysis of two generally accepted cases of successful mentorship in the Army. Then these cases will be reviewed in light of the "traditional" concept presented in Chapter IV to illustrate the concept's utility.

Chapter VI analyzes seven military studies on mentoring, conducted since 1984. These studies reveal how the Army in the field views mentoring and how it is currently being practiced.

Chapter VII summarily assesses how well mentoring, as currently being practiced throughout the Army, fits the comprehensive definition or "traditional" concept of mentoring and it recommends what future Department of the Army doctrine should be regarding mentoring as a concept for developing future leaders.

ENDNOTES

1. United States. Department of the Army, Pamphlet 600-50, p. 5.
2. John C. Krysa, "Mentoring--More Than Just Another Trendy Concept," Field Artillery Journal, November-December 1985, p. 17.
3. United States. Department of the Army, Results of the Professional Development of Officers Study (PDOS) Group Report, February 1985, p. 8.
4. General John A. Wickham, Jr., Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, letter to the Army's General Officers, 8 November 1985.

CHAPTER II

THE MILITARY PERSPECTIVE ON MENTORING

In an effort to help define the mentoring process, an examination of the mentoring phenomenon from the military perspective is required. This review will examine current Army publications on mentoring, will survey the military professional's views on mentoring, and will provide an overview of what is being taught in the Army's professional military educational system.

ARMY PUBLICATIONS

Army publications, in general, provide minimum coverage on the subject of mentoring. Department of the Army Field Manual 22-103, Leadership and Command at Senior Levels, does not specifically mention mentoring. However, it does discuss coaching, teaching and role modeling in the leader development process.¹

Department of the Army Pamphlet 600-80, Executive Leadership, provides the best description of the subject when it addresses leader development through mentoring. It defines mentoring as a "process used to develop the thinking skills and frames of reference for sequential and progressive leader development."² Mentoring is differentiated from coaching. "Coaching focuses on here-and-now performance and is the responsibility of immediate superiors. Superiors once removed

are the mentors, and they are concerned with assessing potential and developing the capabilities and frames of reference that will be required in the future."³ The pamphlet points out that mentoring cannot be imposed as a requirement. Consequently, executive leaders are responsible only for establishing and reinforcing a mentoring structure through the organization and setting the example.⁴

MILITARY PROFESSIONAL'S VIEWS ON MENTORING

Lieutenant General Charles W. Bagnal, Earl C. Pence and Lieutenant Colonel Thomas N. Meriwether define a mentor as an experienced, senior leader or manager, often at the executive level, who develops a younger, less experienced leader and provides career counseling and sponsorship to the individual. They specify the characteristics of mentorship by outlining what the mentor provides for the protege: the mentor clarifies career goals and helps develop a long-term strategy for career planning and advancement; he aids in the development of short-term individual development plans; and he shares knowledge and provides instruction in technical matters as well as in leadership and management skills. The mentor includes the protege in activities which will allow him or her to develop the frame of reference, values and skills required at higher organizational levels. He provides counseling on job-related or personal problems. He provides visibility for the protege and

intervenes to insure that the protege receives the assignments and experience required for advancement.⁵

Bagnal, Pence and Meriwether then characterize the mentorship style of leadership as offering open communication with subordinates, role modeling of appropriate values, the executive's counseling of subordinates to assist in career development, and sharing the leader's frame of reference with subordinate leaders. They contend that mentorship of junior leaders by senior commanders is one of the most obvious ways, and perhaps the most effective way, to develop an understanding of higher frames of reference in subordinate leaders.⁶ Their description of mentoring clearly emphasizes the mentor's role in developing subordinates. They minimize the role of sponsorship.

Major General Kenneth A. Jolemore strongly supports the ten functions of a mentor as identified by Daniel Lea and Zandy B. Leibowitz: teaching, guiding, advising, sponsoring, role modeling, validating, counseling, motivating, protecting, and communicating.⁷ He further asserts that a mentor can do all of these things and thereby help a protege to develop self-confidence and grow. He stresses that a mentor should share his ideas and values with the protege, make the protege visible to top-level leadership, and give the protege an opportunity to share invaluable contacts.⁸ He cautions that without a proper understanding of the full spectrum of mentor functions, a mentor can easily be distracted into discussing and practicing something other than mentoring. Jolemore agrees with General Wickham that

every leader should be a teacher and coach, but he does not think all leaders are qualified to be mentors in the traditional sense. He claims that through the mentoring behaviors of teaching, guiding, advising and counseling, a mentor will identify several subordinates who, in his or her opinion, deserve special attention. These subordinates then might become proteges who will benefit from the additional mentor behaviors of promoting and sponsoring.⁹

Lewis Sorley holds that the central element of mentoring is clearly the development of subordinates. The mentor tries to develop the person with whom he or she is dealing, most probably from a long-term perspective.¹⁰ He addresses four roles of the mentor with counseling as being central to the mentor's role. This includes advice on how to maximize strengths and minimize weaknesses and addresses such things as the kinds of assignments and schooling the protege should seek. Second, the mentor's evaluating should include constructive criticism. Third is a mentor encouraging activities. The better the officer is, the more he is critical of his abilities to meet the highest standards. Consequently, the best people tend to get down on themselves in some respects. Encouragement from the mentor is vital in such instances. Finally, the most important mentoring role is transmitting values. The mentor instills in his protege the worthiness of being a professional, the need for self-enforced commitment to standards of performance, self-restraint, self-sacrifice and loyalty down.¹¹ Also, Sorley focuses on

creating a climate for effective mentoring and on concentrating on the best people to develop as proteges.¹²

Lieutenant Colonel George B. Forsythe, Colonel Howard T. Prince II, Colonel John M. Wattendorf and Captain Gayle L. Watkins attempt to establish a framework for leader development. They, too, assert that the concept of mentoring focuses attention on the development of leaders.¹³ Major L. M. Ewing characterizes mentoring as a more nebulous concept than leadership. He sees the mentoring relationship going beyond counseling and teaching. Mentors set examples and are role models for proper and consistent behavior. Additionally, they inspire trust and confidence because of their respect for others.¹⁴ Lieutenant Colonel Larry H. Ingraham points out that coaching is not mentoring. The coach coaches one level below, and the mentor mentors two levels down. The purpose of mentoring is to provide the protege with a glimpse of the context in which the mentor makes decisions. He concludes that while we talk about mentoring, few practice it because mentoring (setting context) is confused with coaching (giving instructions).¹⁵

Major James O. Patterson defines mentorship as a "service performed in an atmosphere of mutual trust, professional respect, and comradeship in which selected senior soldiers share experiences, knowledge, and challenges with selected junior soldiers, with the goal of improving the Army through increased individual maturity, higher and deeper levels of knowledge, and the full achievement of potential."¹⁶ He supports this

definition by citing five roles the mentor performs: friend, leader, teacher, counselor, and trusted person.

A mentor is a friend. While friendship is a relationship which develops from sharing common experiences and stresses in the military environment, the mentorship relationship is stronger. The mentor and his protege become comrades. There is a bond formed between the two soldiers. The mentor cares for his protege and nurtures his professional and personal development.¹⁷

A mentor is a leader, but a special type of leader. A leader owes equal attention to all subordinates, but a mentor devotes extra time to a single individual, yet is not bound to do so. A leader is most often in the subordinate's chain of command. But a mentor is very seldom in the protege's chain of command, which precludes favoritism. A leader's style and methods are fairly well established and addressed in doctrinal literature, but a mentor's strength of style and methods rest in an idiosyncratic approach. A mentor acts with little or no doctrinal background or resource material. All persons in leadership positions must perform as leaders, but mentoring is strictly voluntary. The chain of command depends on leadership, so leaders designate official time for their leadership activities. There are fixed terms of leadership. However, mentorship is time independent; it can last until the death of either the mentor or protege. Leadership has a legal base in the Uniform Code of Military Justice, the oath of commission and the

Constitution. The "authority" for mentorship, however, is personal consent.¹⁸

A mentor is a teacher. The difference between teaching as a mentor and teaching as a leader or trainer is one of focus. The mentor reinforces the teaching of trainers. The mentor also goes beyond the trainer's teaching; he provides frank, bloodless, and unmenacing criticism. He supports a long-term positive growth in the protege. The mentor encourages the protege to seek out reasons for his actions and reactions. The mentor focuses on the protege's future, helping to delineate the professional development needed to arrive at career goals.¹⁹

A mentor is a counselor and thus, must be a person who is trusted. Proteges rely on their mentors for education and advice which will affect them in far-reaching and significant ways. In this relationship, there is a strong bond of confidentiality. Both must trust the other in the knowledge that what transpires in the relationship will be kept in confidence.²⁰

Patterson contends that not everyone can become a mentor, nor can everyone become a protege. If mentorship were structured into a formalized program, it would fail. It is simply too idiosyncratic in its approach and far too select in its applicability to be institutionalized. He holds that the essence of mentorship is to improve the force in the long term.²¹

MENTORSHIP TRAINING IN PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION

Mentoring receives minimum exposure in formal classroom instruction in the Army's formal military educational system. At the United States Military Academy, the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, and the Army War College at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, the concept of mentoring is mentioned in conjunction with subjects like coaching, teaching and counseling during leadership instruction. No attempt is made to explore the concept in depth. Only at the United States Infantry School is the subject of mentoring covered in any detail. In the Infantry Officer Advanced Course, a mentor is defined as a trusted counselor and guide, a teacher, a coach, and more. He is described as having the commitment of a guardian and the duty of a tutor. He has a personal stake in the positive development of his subordinates. Mentor relationships are characterized as typically lasting four to ten years. The usual age difference between the mentor and protege ranges from eight to fifteen years. The mentor is usually two organizational levels above the protege. Finally, the mentor is considered an expert in his field.²²

The Army community has essentially defined the term mentor, to mean a leader who uses an idiosyncratic style of developing subordinates who are usually outside the mentor's sphere of command. Mentorship style is characterized by open communication with subordinates, role modeling of appropriate values, the

effective use of counseling for subordinate development, and the sharing of the leader's frame of reference with subordinate leaders. This definition clearly emphasizes subordinate development. Sponsorship is peripheral to other mentoring activities. It is important to note, however, that a mentorship style of leadership is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for a leader to be successful in developing subordinates. Other factors such as age differentials and the time required for a mentor-protege relationship to develop will influence a leader's success in applying a mentorship style of leadership in developing subordinate leaders.

Much of the information these military writers have relied upon in attempting to define mentoring is drawn from the work of the civilian academic community, which will be surveyed in the next chapter.

ENDNOTES

1. United States. Department of the Army, Field Manual 22-103, pp. 9-10.
2. United States. Department of the Army, Pamphlet 600-80, p. 49.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., p. 50.
5. Charles W. Bagnal, Earl C. Pence, and Thomas N. Meriwether, "Leaders as Mentors," Military Review, July 1985, p. 7.
6. Ibid., p. 6.
7. Kenneth A. Jolemore, "The Mentor: More Than a Teacher, More Than a Coach," Military Review, July 1986, pp. 8-10.
8. Ibid., p. 10.
9. Ibid., pp. 16-17.
10. Lewis Sorley, "In Search of a Mentor," Military Review, August 1988, p. 74.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid.
13. George B. Forsythe, et al., "Framework for Leader Development," Military Review, November 1988, p. 19.
14. L. M. Ewing, "Mentoring: Much More Than a Senior-Junior Relationship," Army, September 1986, p. 20.
15. Larry H. Ingraham, "Caring Is Not Enough: An Uninvited Talk to Army Leaders," Military Review, December 1987, p. 47.
16. James O. Patterson, "Defining Mentorship," Armor, November-December 1985, p. 37.
17. Ibid., p. 35.
18. Ibid., pp. 36-37.
19. Ibid., p. 37.
20. Ibid., p. 35.

21. Ibid., p. 39.

22. United States Army Combined Arms Center, Officer
Advanced Course Leadership Core Curriculum, August 1984, p. 7-2.

CHAPTER III

THE CIVILIAN PERSPECTIVE ON MENTORING

In a further effort to arrive at a useful, comprehensive definition of mentoring, let's examine the mentoring phenomenon as it has been described by the civilian academic sector. This review will focus on the characteristics of the mentor, roles the mentor plays in the process, effects of mentoring on both the mentor and the protege, acquisition of a mentor, differences between mentoring relationships and other relationships, and the special considerations of cross-gender mentoring.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MENTOR

Kathy E. Kram describes four common characteristics found in mentorships. First, proteges are allowed to "address concerns about self, career, and family by providing opportunities to gain knowledge, skills, and competence (from their mentors), and to address personal and professional dilemmas (with their mentors)." Second, both participants benefit since the relationships "respond to current needs and concerns of the two people involved." Third, the relationships "occur in an organizational context that greatly influences when and how they unfold." Fourth, these relationships "are not readily available to most people in organizations."¹

Gerald R. Roche lists seven characteristics of mentors which top-level executives, who had been mentored, suggested as

important for successful mentorship: willingness to share knowledge and understanding, ability and willingness to counsel subordinates, knowledge of the organization and people in it, high rank or position in the organization, respect from peers, knowledge and use of power, and upward mobility.²

According to David M. Hunt and Carol Michael, the most common traits that characterize a mentor and differentiate him or her from the protege are age, organizational position, power and self-confidence.³ Mentors generally are older than their proteges.⁴ Daniel J. Levinson found that mentors were usually older than their proteges by half a generation, roughly eight to fifteen years.⁵ This appears to be the ideal age spread between mentor and protege. Levinson believes that if the age difference is twenty years or greater, the relationship will be more that of a parent-child, which would interfere with the mentoring function.⁶ Kram states that mentors who are twenty or thirty years older than their proteges may face significant communication or values problems caused by generation differences.⁷ Both authors agree that age differences of less than six to eight years are likely to cause the participants to treat each other as peers, thereby minimizing mentoring potentials. At a minimum, the mentor must be old enough to have accumulated the experience necessary to benefit the protege.

Mentors are often highly placed, powerful, and knowledgeable individuals who are not threatened by the protege's potential for equalling or surpassing them. They are also self-confident

professionals who show genuine concern for the needs and development of their proteges.³ Roche's list of seven key characteristics of the mentor focuses on the mentor's position, power, knowledge, and respect; he does not address the characteristics of age and gender as other scholars have. He suggests that proteges look for the aforementioned characteristics in selecting a mentor. In ranking the characteristics most important for a mentor to have, Roche's respondents gave the highest value to a mentor's "willingness to share knowledge and understanding."⁹ David C. McClelland and David H. Burnham found that successful managers share participative styles, exhibit coaching behavior, and have a stronger need for power than do less successful managers.¹⁰ Significantly, one of the needs that the mentor may bring to the relationship is the need for power. Kram found that managers, as mentors of successful proteges, gained status and esteem in the eyes of their peers and superiors.¹¹ By using past and present proteges, mentors can spread their influence through both the informal and formal networks of an organization. Thus, serving as a mentor can satisfy a need for power.¹²

As indicated, numerous authors have attempted to define mentoring by describing specific characteristics that the mentor may possess. Despite this popular approach, the mentoring concept remains difficult to translate into management practice. Klauss, Lea, Leibowitz, Shapiro, and others, contend that mentoring can be best understood by focusing not on the mentors'

characteristics, but on what mentors do--the roles they assume in the relationship.

ROLES OF THE MENTOR

The roles and functions of the mentor are discussed throughout the literature in varying degrees. But all analysts attempt to define exactly what a mentor does or is supposed to do. "Even the most recent literature is still struggling to define what a mentor is and does."¹³ However, in spite of the range of findings and differing labels, most of the research can be assembled into a fairly cohesive construct of a mentor's functions.

Levinson describes mentorship as "one of the most complex, and developmentally important, relationships a man (protege) can have in early adulthood."¹⁴ He further states that "mentoring is defined not in terms of formal roles but in terms of the character of the relationship and functions it serves."¹⁵ Levinson outlines the functions or roles of a mentor as: a teacher who enhances the skills and intellectual development of the protege, a sponsor who facilitates entry and advancement of the protege, a guide who acquaints the protege with the values of the organization, an exemplar who serves as a role model, and a counselor who gives advice and moral support.¹⁶ According to Levinson, the mentor serves as a transitional figure for a person moving through the early stages of adult life. Thus, he emphasizes functional rather than formal roles.

Lea and Leibowitz perhaps offer the most comprehensive and concise listing of roles played by the mentor. They assert that mentorship can best be understood by focusing on what mentors do. Their consolidation of ten behaviors--teaching, guiding, advising, counseling, sponsoring, role modeling, validating, motivating, protecting, and communicating--form what is generally accepted as the mentoring process.¹⁷ A more detailed look into each of the roles is necessary to further understand exactly what it is the mentor does.

Teaching is instruction in the specific skill and knowledge necessary for successful job performance or other assistance in the person's career development. They expand on this idea by stating that the mentor, in the role of teacher, does not teach the protege his or her job.¹⁸ Guiding orients the novice to the "unwritten" or informal rules of the organization. Advising is usually a specific response to a request by the protege; it differs from advice given by others in its quality. Counseling provides emotional support in stressful times and may help to clarify career goals or develop plans of action to achieve those goals. Sponsoring provides growth opportunities for the protege. It should not be confused with a free ride. What happens once the mentor has opened the door for the protege is largely the protege's responsibility. Role modeling allows the mentor to serve as a person whom the protege can emulate. This usually occurs subconsciously as the protege patterns his or her behavior after that of the mentor. Validating occurs when the mentor

evaluates, modifies, and finally endorses those goals or aspirations of the protege that the mentor feels are realistic and proper. Motivating provides the encouragement and impetus for the protege to work towards achievement of his or her goals. Protecting provides a non-threatening environment where the protege can make mistakes without losing self-confidence. The mentor thus acts as a buffer for the protege's risk taking. This important function enhances future decision making when the protege is faced with uncertainty. Communicating is essential if the other nine mentoring behaviors are to be effective for experience means very little if it cannot be communicated.¹⁹

Rudi Klauss examined mentor relationships in the public sector, particularly the roles of formal mentor-advisor systems in management and executive development programs within the federal government. He identified major roles and responsibilities of the mentor, which he placed in five areas: career strategy advising, individual development plan counseling, sponsoring and mediating, monitoring and giving feedback, and role modeling.²⁰ All of these functions can be easily compared to the list of mentoring roles proposed by Lea and Leibowitz. For example, giving feedback falls under the purview of communication. He qualifies his study by indicating that not all roles are performed by all mentors. He also suggests that there are three protege roles: initiating contact and seeking advice, sharing needs and personal goals, and listening. He implies that the relationship is continually controlled by the protege. In

addition, the degree to which each role is played, if played at all, varies.²¹ He states "the notion that mentors provide a clear and uncomplicated path to career success is far from being accurate."²²

Hunt and Michael claim that the greatest value of the mentor is the role of teacher.²³ Hunt further emphasizes that "mentoring is historically and traditionally an 'informal process' that links senior and junior members of professions and/or organizations together. Mentors pass on skills, awake proteges politically, guide, counsel, cajole, or even reprimand them, while at the same time hoping to bask in the success of their proteges who succeed."²⁴

Elizabeth Alleman characterizes mentoring as an informal relationship in which a person of greater rank and expertise teaches, counsels, guides, develops and takes a personal interest in the professional career of a younger adult.²⁵

Eileen C. Shapiro, Florence P. Haseltine and Mary P. Rowe place the mentor-protege relationship on a continuum--an overall spectrum they describe as a "patron system." Roles of patrons include being advisors, guides, protectors, sponsors, champions, benefactors, advocates and supporters. They postulate that within this system mentors and peer pals serve as endpoints on the continuum, while sponsors and guides are internal points along the continuum.²⁶ "Peer pals" describes the relationship between peers helping each other to succeed and progress by

sharing information, advice and strategies with one another. Basically, peer pals help each other while helping themselves.

At the one-third point on the continuum they place guides. These people can be invaluable in explaining the system. Secretaries are placed in this group; their primary functions are to point out pitfalls to be avoided and shortcuts to be taken. Further, they provide valuable intelligence for their proteges.

Sponsors were placed at the two-thirds point on the continuum. They are strong patrons, but less powerful than mentors in promoting and shaping the careers of their proteges. Finally, at the upper end of the continuum are the mentors. Shapiro, Haseltine and Rowe define this relationship as the most intense and paternalistic of the types of patrons designated along the continuum.²⁷ They further contend that within the patron system, the mentor-protege relationship tends to be more hierarchical and parental, more intense and exclusionary and more elitist. It is restrictive and comes with strings attached. In the final analysis, however, this type of relationship can result in the greatest boost toward success.²⁸ Though they relate the patron system continuum to the upward mobility of the female protege, their definition of mentoring encompasses nearly all of the roles of the mentor discussed elsewhere in the literature.

They also promote the idea that a role model is an appropriate term to use, because in reality persons do not model the mentor as a whole. They may only model those features which are beneficial to their own development. Some of the

characteristics of a mentor (role model) may even be detrimental to the personal development of the protege.²⁹

The Woodlands Group, an informal group of training and development specialists, make an important distinction between the developmental role of a mentor and that of either a coach or a sponsor. Sponsors function to enhance the career progression of subordinates by giving them visibility, actively seeking career opportunities for the subordinates and advising them on obtaining desired assignments. Coaches help subordinates meet specific growth needs by providing challenging tasks, constant feedback and counsel on how to improve performance. The mentor functions as both coach and sponsor, but he has a much greater impact on subordinates than either the coach or sponsor. The mentorship relationship is characterized by much greater intensity, informality and trust than either the coach or sponsorship relationship. Caring is at the core of this mentor-protege relationship.³⁰

Based on this quick overview it is apparent that there are many overlapping and varied ideas of what the roles and functions of a mentor should be. But, by and large, most researchers' findings were similar. Most researchers agree that all mentoring roles are not played by a single mentor, nor are they of equal intensity in all relationships. Also, one or more mentors may prove significantly helpful throughout a protege's career.

EFFECTS OF MENTORING ON THE MENTOR AND THE PROTEGE

Regardless of the roles assumed by the mentor, the mentoring relationship can produce both immediate and long-lasting benefits, or it can result in damage for all concerned. Thus, the effects may be positive or negative.

Advantages of Mentoring for the Mentor

The supervisor or manager who becomes a mentor enjoys the satisfaction of having helped another work toward his or her goals.³¹ Mentors also experience a feeling of self-importance from the respect given by the protege and interest shown in the mentor's stories of past successes. For many mentors, the treatment of his or her advice as guidelines or principles, or role modeling, is enough to warrant continuing a relationship that can lead to lasting friendship.³² Reich's study found that "mentors (75-90 percent) highly valued being able to keep high flyers on their team and thus improve group performance." Another positive, but less tangible, effect reported by most respondents was that basically, they "felt good about furthering the careers of talented young employees."³³ Many mentors expressed a sense of responsibility for "putting back into life what you get out." Some found satisfaction in being role models, while others simply had the strong desire to develop talent.³⁴ There are many reasons why one assumes the role of mentor. On the more practical side, a mentor may enlist the aid of a protege to help get things done and thereby free up his or her own time

for more important tasks.³⁵ Levinson believes that serving as a mentor provides a creative and rejuvenating life challenge to an adult. Along these same lines, E. H. Erickson states that in the seventh stage of the life cycle, adulthood, one feels the need to leave something of lasting value, to help guide and establish the next generation, or to leave one's mark on the world.³⁶ Erickson uses the term "generativity" to describe this yearning. Fulfilling this need through the mentoring process is one way that a mentor can combat the feeling of stagnation and decline that can often develop during mid-career stress. Thus, "being a mentor can be seen as a vital activity of mature leaders--healthy not only for the organization, but for the mentor as well."³⁷

Advantages of Mentoring for the Protege

Hunt and Michael list the following as advantages for the protege using mentoring as a career training and development tool: better pay, better education opportunities, and more job satisfaction.³⁸ Kram adds to this list an improved sense of self-confidence and worth, advantages from coaching in organizational politics, and protection from critical peers and supervisors.³⁹

Mary C. Johnson supports Kram's views and added that "a mentor is that person you know can teach you how the organization works. They are generally in a position to let those higher up know what a good job you are doing. They are invaluable for the people they put you in contact with."⁴⁰ Theodore J. Halatin

believes the protege can benefit from mentoring by receiving accurate evaluations and analyses of the subordinate's situation. Also, the protege will be more motivated due to the attention he receives and the desire to please the mentor.⁴¹ Murray H. Reich specifies several benefits to the protege: early transfer to more challenging jobs, opportunity to work new and special projects, opportunity to be more creative, enhanced awareness of their strengths/weaknesses, and greater self-confidence.⁴² Additionally, proteges value the opportunity to make tough decisions, learn managerial skills, join winning teams, develop useful contacts and achieve more rapid promotions. He concludes that political assistance was a more amorphous kind of aid and was provided infrequently. Generally, it was considered of less value.⁴³ Klauss found that proteges considered it a special opportunity to be provided with career guidance by those who had had very successful careers and could provide insight into the senior levels of organizational decision making processes. Others in Klauss' study emphasized the importance of visibility and developmental assignments that were afforded through the mentoring relationship.⁴⁴

Disadvantages of Mentoring for the Mentor

Halatin and Rose E. Knotts identify the following potential hazards of mentorship: employee jealousy, time demands on the mentor, tarnished image, overdependency, prohibitive domain, blackmail, embarrassment, discarded loyalty, emotional

involvement and sexual involvement.⁴⁵ Particularly in cross-gender relationships, the risks taken by the mentor may have devastating consequences should the relationship become so close as to cause sexual tension and rumors of liaisons.⁴⁶ Poor performance by a protege also may reflect negatively on the mentor.⁴⁷ The mentor must assume responsibility for concept development and accountability for the outcome of the relationship.⁴⁸

Disadvantages of Mentoring for the Protege

Donald W. Myers and Neil J. Humphreys list seven drawbacks of the relationship for the protege: The protege is used as a "Go For," the mentor becomes a tyrant, the protege becomes a fill-in, cross-gender mentoring leads to sexual harassment, the mentor's bad habits become the protege's, and the mentor retards the protege's growth.⁴⁹ Klauss notes that there can be tensions between the protege and his immediate supervisor when the mentor's plans for the protege conflicts with the supervisor's work plan. In addition, the protege has a direct line of communication to a superior which may violate the chain of command of the organization. Problems with co-workers can also develop from jealousy.⁵⁰ Reich's study found that one-third of the proteges felt they were too closely identified with their mentors. One quarter thought peers marked them as "his person." The problem was compounded when the mentor lost favor with the senior leadership in the organization. This often meant a

blocked promotion path for the protege. Other drawbacks were stress and overprotection.⁵¹

ACQUIRING A MENTOR

There are two dominant views about acquiring a mentor: one holds that the relationship can be created, the other holds that an environment can be created where the phenomenon is allowed to take place.

Stephen C. Bushardt and others list four criteria for selecting a mentor. The protege should seek a person who can help him, a person who has his confidence, a person whom the protege can help, and a person who has a successful track record for developing talent.⁵² They also propose a five-step plan for the protege to "cultivate" a mentor: (1) Visibility--take part in activities that make you visible to your prospective mentor; (2) Competence--display your competence through organizational and personal activities; (3) Indispensability--encourage your mentor to depend on you to complete tasks and to get information; (4) Interests--align your hobbies and interests with those of your prospective mentor to encourage the relationship; (5) Upward mobility--look and act the part of one who is an upwardly mobile manager.⁵³ They also believe mentorship can be made to happen and that the protege should have the tools to prompt the relationship.⁵⁴

Patricia Berry agrees with Bushardt's analysis. She advises women to "look for someone in the executive level or who is

moving that way. Select someone who has a reputation for developing subordinates."⁵⁵

Michael G. Zey reports that the selection procedure for a mentor varies widely between organizations. Most companies allow incoming junior managers to decide for themselves if they want to participate in the mentoring program. Some programs in the federal government allow the protege to choose from a pool of mentors through an interview process. Other companies evaluate the mentors and the proteges, then assignment is made by a panel of executives. Still others assign all new personnel mentors and allow the relationship to take on its own dimensions.⁵⁶

Lea and Leibowitz state that "mentor relationships can't be made to happen. They contend that finding a mentor has many of the drawbacks of finding a spouse or other love mate. The harder one tries and the more one expects of oneself and others, the more likely one is to fail."⁵⁷ Linda Phillips-Jones supports the concept that participation in a formal program must be voluntary.⁵⁸ In some programs, instead of the protege informally selecting the mentor, the mentor is assigned by a training and development staff or by top level managers.⁵⁹

Kram suggests that most often mentors are only available for a few high potential managers. Those not labeled as "fast-trackers" are less likely to find guidance, coaching, challenging assignments, and other opportunities that encourage individuals to develop their human resources fully. Her premise is that organizations should develop their employees' interpersonal

skills, institute effective reward systems, and implement task and management situations that support developmental alliances as vital to the organization's health. In other words, organizations should remove the obstacles that most often restrict interpersonal communication and relationships. In that environment, mentorship will develop naturally.⁶⁰

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS AND OTHER RELATIONSHIPS

The differences between mentoring and other relationships tend to confuse the entire issue of mentoring. Jeanne Lindholm states that "there is no definitional list of things an individual must do in order to be considered a mentor, and there is no clear understanding of the specific ways in which a mentoring relationship differs from a sponsoring relationship or from a good supervisor-subordinate relationship."⁶¹ This is important because it characterizes the major differences between mentoring and other relationships. Lindholm's analysis of mentoring relationships concludes that four factors distinguished mentoring relationships from other relationships. She reports that a mentoring relationship (1) is status-differentiated (with the mentor in the higher status position), (2) exerts a positive influence on the lower's career, (3) is considered "special" by the upper, and (4) involves high personal attraction for the lower on the part of the upper.⁶² Lindholm concludes that the differences between mentor relationships and other types of relationships are subtle; however, the personal and career-

focused rewards of a mentor relationship make it significantly different from other kinds of relationships. She further adds that mentors are expected to influence the careers of their proteges, a finding which supports the claims of other researchers in the area of mentoring.⁶³

Kram contends the mentoring functions are the essential characteristics that differentiate developmental relationships from other relationships in the work environment.⁶⁴ The range of mentoring functions or roles that enhance development can vary depending on the needs of both the mentor and the protege, the interpersonal skills brought to the relationship, and, finally, the organizational context which may, or may not, allow opportunities for interaction.⁶⁵

CROSS-GENDER MENTOR-PROTEGE RELATIONSHIPS

A great deal of literature has discussed the topic of gender in the mentor-protege relationship. Particular focus has been placed upon cross-gender mentoring. Levinson states that proteges should have mentors of the same sex.⁶⁶ Hunt and Michael contend that Levinson's argument is biased because his sample is limited only to men attempting to advance in traditionally male-dominated fields.⁶⁷ There is, however, a lack of female role models or mentors in traditionally male-dominated career fields. Thus, career-oriented women often seek mentors in much the same way as young adult males.⁶⁸ One study on the histories of twenty-five successful women managers found nearly all of them

had used men as role models; they often credited their male mentors with providing the encouragement and training they needed to rise to upper management.⁶⁹ Little information exists on female mentor-female protege or female mentor-male protege relationships. However, Kram notes that male mentor-female protege relationships produce special complexities. Both mentor and protege must deal with tensions brought about by intimacy and sexual concerns, increased public scrutiny, and collusion in stereotypical male/female roles.⁷⁰ While the male model of mentorship may not be totally applicable for females, and while the scarcity of females is apparent in traditional male-dominated careers, mentors are viewed as crucial tools for training and promoting career success for both males and females.⁷¹

According to the literature, the roles of a mentor are many and varied; still, they tend to fall under the general categories of career counseling and psychosocial functions. Mentoring appears to be a human resource development tool whereby mentors help their proteges learn their profession at an increased rate and to a greater depth. The following chapter will present a concept of mentoring that by and large summarizes the theories, ideas and opinions set forth in Chapters II and III.

ENDNOTES

1. Kathy E. Kram, Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life, p. 2.
2. Gerald R. Roche, "Much Ado About Mentors," Harvard Business Review, January-February 1979, p. 24.
3. David M. Hunt and Carol Michael, "Mentorship: A Career Training and Development Tool," Academy of Management Review, July 1983, p. 480.
4. Ibid.
5. Daniel J. Levinson, et al., The Seasons of a Man's Life, p. 18.
6. Ibid.
7. Kram, p. 15.
8. Hunt and Michael, p. 481.
9. Roche, p. 29.
10. David C. McClelland and David H. Burnham, "Power is the Great Motivator," Harvard Business Review, March-April 1976, pp. 107-109.
11. Kram, p. 15.
12. Hunt and Michael, p. 481.
13. Benjamin L. Dilla, "Mentoring: Cause and Effect of Good Leadership," Proceedings of the Association of Human Resource Management and Organizational Behavior, 1985, p. 632.
14. Levinson, et al., p. 17.
15. Ibid., p. 98.
16. Ibid., p. 100.
17. Daniel Lea and Zandy B. Leibowitz, "A Mentor: Would You Know One If You Saw One?" Supervisory Management, April 1983, p. 33.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid., pp. 33-35.

20. Rudi Klauss, "Formalized Mentor Relationships for Management and Executive Development Programs in the Federal Government," Public Administration Review, July-August 1981, p. 492.
21. Ibid., pp. 491-492.
22. Ibid., p. 491.
23. Hunt and Michael, p. 483.
24. David M. Hunt, "Formal vs. Informal Mentoring: Towards a Framework," in Mentoring: Aid to Excellence in Career Development, Business and the Professions, Vol II: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Mentoring, ed. by William A. Gray and Marilynne Miles Gray, p. 9.
25. Elizabeth Alleman, "Measuring Mentoring--Frequency, Quality, Impact," in Mentoring: Aid to Excellence in Career Development, Business and the Professions, Vol II: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Mentoring, ed. by William A. Gray and Marilynne Miles Gray, p. 45.
26. Eileen C. Shapiro, Florence P. Haseltine, and Mary P. Rowe, "Moving Up: Role Models, Mentors, and the 'Patron System,'" Sloan Management Review, Spring 1978, p. 55.
27. Ibid., pp. 55-56.
28. Ibid., p. 56.
29. Ibid., p. 53.
30. Woodlands Group, "Management Development Roles: Coach, Sponsor and Mentor," Personnel Journal, November 1980, p. 920.
31. Theodore J. Halatin, "Why Be A Mentor?" Supervisory Management, February 1981, p. 36.
32. Ibid., p. 37.
33. Murray H. Reich, "Executive Views From Both Sides of Mentoring," Personnel, March 1985, p. 44.
34. E. H. Erickson, Childhood and Society, p. 58.
35. Stephen C. Bushardt, et al., "Picking the Right Person For Your Mentor," Advanced Management Journal, Summer 1982, p. 49.
36. Dilla, p. 633.

37. Ibid., p. 634.
38. Hunt and Michael, p. 487.
39. Kram, p. 29.
40. Mary C. Johnson, "Mentors--the Key to Growth and Development," Training and Development Journal, July 1980, p. 41.
41. Halatin, p. 37.
42. Murray H. Reich, "The Mentor Connection," Personnel, February 1986, p. 52.
43. Reich, "Executive Views From Both Sides of Mentoring," p. 43.
44. Klauss, p. 493.
45. Theodore J. Halatin and Rose E. Knotts, "Becoming a Mentor: Are the Risks Worth the Rewards?" Supervisory Management, February 1982, pp. 27-29.
46. Lawton W. Fitt and Derek A. Newton, "When the Mentor is a Man and the Protege a Woman," Harvard Business Review, March-April 1981, p. 60.
47. Hunt and Michael, p. 479.
48. Halatin and Knotts, p. 29.
49. Donald W. Myers and Neil J. Humphreys, "Caveats in Mentorship," Business Horizons, July-August 1984, pp. 11-12.
50. Klauss, p. 494.
51. Reich, "The Mentor Connection," p. 53.
52. Bushardt, et al., p. 49.
53. Ibid.
54. Ibid., p. 48.
55. Patricia Berry, "Mentors for Women Managers: Fast Track to Corporate Success?" Supervisory Management, August 1983, p. 37.
56. Michael G. Zey, "Mentor Programs, Making the Right Moves," Personnel Journal, February 1985, p. 55.
57. Lea and Leibowitz, p. 35.

58. Linda Phillips-Jones, "Establishing a Formalized Mentoring Program," Training and Development Journal, February 1983, p. 39.
59. Klauss, p. 40.
60. Kram, p. 40.
61. Jeanne Lindholm, "Mentoring: The Mentor's Perspective," 1982, p. 5.
62. Ibid.
63. Ibid., p. 6
64. Kram, p. 22.
65. Ibid., p. 40.
66. Levinson, et al., p. 18.
67. Hunt and Michael, p. 480.
68. M. F. Cook, "Is the Mentor Relationship Primarily a Male Experience?" Personnel Administrator, October 1979, pp. 82-86.
69. Berry, p. 37.
70. Kram, p. 105.
71. Roche, p. 27.

CHAPTER IV

THE "TRADITIONAL" CONCEPT OF MENTORING

This chapter outlines a concept of mentoring which, for lack of a better term, will be called the "traditional" concept. The concept, proposed by Kathy E. Kram, generally encompasses the perspectives of most professionals on the subject of mentoring. Consequently, it seems well suited as a useful, comprehensive definition of mentoring. Further, it is dynamic enough to accommodate the differences between the civilian and military environments. Other roles and functions may certainly be added, but those presented here will be referred to throughout the remainder of this paper.

MENTORSHIP FUNCTIONS

Mentoring functions can be divided into two subgroups: career and psychosocial. Career functions are "those aspects of the relationship that enhance career development." Psychosocial functions "enhance (the) sense of competence, identity, and effectiveness in a professional role."¹ If the mentor is two or more levels above his protege in the organization, his experience, tenure, rank, and influence within the organization facilitate the career functions. If the mentor is eight to fifteen years older than the protege, a peer-like relationship is avoided. Then, through mutual trust and increasing intimacy, the psychosocial functions flourish.

As a career function, sponsorship is the active nomination of the protege for desirable lateral moves and promotions. Without it, the protege could be overlooked for promotion despite his competence or performance.²

The exposure-and-visibility function enhances the protege's career development gaining him responsibilities which allow him to develop relationships with key organizational figures who judge his potential for advancement. Additionally, the protege is prepared for positions of increased responsibility and authority while he is visible to those who can influence his fate in the organization.³

Coaching is the career function which increases the protege's knowledge and understanding of how to effectively operate in the organization. The mentor performs this function by suggesting appropriate strategies for accomplishing work objectives; thus the protege achieves recognition and fulfills career aspirations. The mentor also benefits from coaching since he confirms the values of his experiences by passing on useful knowledge and perspectives to his protege.⁴

Protection is a double-edged sword which can either support or smother the protege. Nonetheless, protection shields the protege from untimely or potentially damaging contact with other senior officials.⁵ A fine balance exists between this function and that of exposure-and-visibility. Protection also provides an environment in which the protege can take risks without fear of career-damaging censure, which could follow unprotected failure.

The last career function of mentoring provides the protege with challenging assignments. This function goes beyond those career-enhancing jobs to which any future senior leader would aspire. The assignment of challenging work, coupled with technical training and ongoing performance feedback, allows the protege to

develop specific competencies and to experience a sense of accomplishment in a professional role. It is critical in preparing the protege to perform well on difficult tasks so that he or she can move forward. Without challenging assignments, a junior person remains unprepared for positions of greater responsibility and authority.⁶

Psychosocial functions should not allow the mentor to create a clone. Through role modeling, the mentor provides the protege with attitudes, values, and behavior worthy of emulation. If the mentor sets a desirable example, the protege will identify with it and, over time, develop his own identity by emulating "certain aspects of the senior person's style and . . . reject(ing) others."⁷

The acceptance-and-confirmation function is mutually beneficial: "Both individuals derive a sense of self from the positive regard conveyed by the other. As the protege develops confidence, the mentor's acceptance-and-confirmation provide support and encouragement. In later years, a protege's acceptance-and-confirmation provide support for the wisdom and experience offered the next generation."⁸ The protege can experiment with new behaviors. Eventually, he becomes more willing to disagree with his mentor, thereby establishing a

relationship which "tolerates differences and thus allows self-differentiation." The mentor, perhaps blocked from further advancement and faced with aging and obsolescence, gains support and appreciation from his protege. This enables him to find value in what he can still offer to his protege and the organization.⁹

Counseling is the function which helps the protege to explore personal concerns which may interfere with his achieving a positive sense of self in the organization. The protege finds "a forum in which to talk openly about anxieties, fears, and ambivalence that detract from productive work." The mentor "provides a sounding board for this self-exploration, offers personal experience as an alternative perspective, and helps resolve problems through feedback and active listening." The protege can share his fears, doubts, and concerns without risking exposure to others in the organization. Likewise, the mentor satisfies important needs by helping the protege to successfully cope with personal dilemmas.¹⁰

Friendship, the last of the psychosocial functions, is perhaps the most elusive, given the differences in age and organizational positions between mentor and protege. Mutual liking and understanding and enjoyable informal discussions about work and outside work experiences can lead to friendship.¹¹ Friendship can amplify the other functions and helps the participants to better accept the differences between them.

A "traditional" mentorship would provide this full range of the functions. However, many relationships contain only a subset of the full range of functions. Every mentorship will be different because of the different personalities, backgrounds, capabilities, and talents involved. The absence of one or more functions does not necessarily indicate the relationship does not qualify as mentorship.

MENTORSHIP PHASES

A mentorship can be divided into four phases: initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition. The initiation phase averages six months to a year; the protege emerges as a person whose potential is worth developing. Contacts between the mentor and protege reinforce the sense that the mentor-protege relationship is possible; thus, it becomes important to both participants.¹² Fantasies become concrete expectations, expectations are met, and then there are opportunities for interaction around work tasks.¹³

The cultivation phase generally lasts from two to five years. During this phase, "the range of career and psychosocial functions that characterize a mentor relationship peaks. Generally, career functions emerge first. As the interpersonal bond strengthens with time, psychosocial functions emerge."¹⁴ The relationship during this phase will change as the protege grows in competence and self-worth. This phase ends when changes in individual needs and/or organizational requirements occur.

The separation phase generally lasts six months to two years, "after a significant change in the structural role relationship and/or in the emotional experience of the relationship."¹⁵ This phase is an adjustment period because "career and psychosocial functions can no longer continue in their previous form; the loss of some functions, and the modification of others, ultimately lead to a redefinition of the relationship."¹⁶ Job rotation or promotion may limit opportunities for continued interaction. Or the protege may no longer want guidance; he or she may now seek the opportunity to work autonomously. Likewise, the mentor may face midlife crisis and become less available to the protege. Or a blocked opportunity may create resentment and hostility that disrupt positive interaction.¹⁷

The redefinition phase covers an indefinite period after the separation phase. The relationship either ends or develops significantly different characteristics, evolving into a more peer-like friendship. While some functions stop or decrease, sponsorship from a distance, occasional counseling and coaching, and friendship normally continue. This phase can be marked by the protege's succeeding to the same or higher position in the organization as that held by his mentor.¹⁸

The "traditional" concept of mentoring has enabled sensitive leaders to identify big winners early. Only a few qualify, but those who have qualified are groomed early for the positions of highest responsibility. We will see examples of this in the next

chapter when we examine the Pershing-Marshall and Marshall-Eisenhower mentorships. These two mentorships will also serve to illustrate the utility of the "traditional" concept of mentoring.

ENDNOTES

1. Kathy E. Kram, Mentoring At Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life, p. 23.

2. Ibid., p. 25.
3. Ibid., p. 27.
4. Ibid., pp. 28-29.
5. Ibid., pp. 29-30.
6. Ibid., pp. 31-32.
7. Ibid., p. 33.
8. Ibid., p. 35.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid., pp. 36-37.
11. Ibid., p. 38.
12. Ibid., pp. 51-53.
13. Ibid., p. 52.
14. Ibid., p. 53.
15. Ibid., p. 49.
16. Ibid., pp. 56-57.
17. Ibid., pp. 56-60.
18. Ibid., p. 49.

CHAPTER V

APPLICATION OF THE "TRADITIONAL" CONCEPT TO
TWO HISTORICAL EXAMPLES OF MENTORSHIP

An analysis of the mentor-protege relationships between Pershing-Marshall and Marshall-Eisenhower from the perspective of the "traditional" concept of mentoring will illustrate the utility of the "traditional" concept.

MENTORSHIP COMPARISON

A mutual link between the two relationships was General of the Army George C. Marshall. General Marshall was a protege of General of the Armies John J. Pershing. General Marshall, in turn, mentored General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower.¹ General Pershing was 20 years older than General Marshall and Marshall was 10 years older than General Eisenhower. When Marshall became Pershing's aide-de-camp, General Pershing was the Commanding General, American Expeditionary Force, in France. Marshall was a brevet colonel who reverted back to captain at the end of the war.² Pershing was later promoted to General of the Armies and eventually became the Army Chief of Staff. Marshall advanced only to lieutenant colonel while assigned as Pershing's aide. General Marshall was the Army Chief of Staff when he brought Brigadier General Eisenhower to the War Department as Chief of War Plans, later Operations Division.³ Within less than a year, Eisenhower was a lieutenant general and commander of the European Theater of Operations. By war's end, both mentor and

protege were Generals of the Army. Then Eisenhower replaced Marshall as Army Chief of Staff. Both mentors were at least two grades higher in rank and position than their proteges and they were older by eight to twenty years.

MENTORSHIP PHASES

Initiation Phase

The initiation phase begins when the mentor has identified the protege as a potential senior leader. Marshall first came to Pershing's attention on October 3, 1917, when he compelled Pershing to listen to his explanation of a new method of attacking entrenched troops. General Pershing had just finished castigating Marshall's division commander and chief of staff for giving poor and ill-prepared critiques of the new method designed by Marshall. But Captain Marshall was determined that Pershing receive the facts behind the performance.⁴ For the rest of World War I, Pershing monitored Marshall's performance. Thoroughly impressed by Marshall and his demonstrated mastery of operational planning, Pershing asked him to become his aide-de-camp on April 30, 1919.⁵ This initiation phase took 18 months.

Likewise, Eisenhower became known to Marshall as early as 1930 when he talked to Marshall in the Office of the American Battle Monuments Commission in Washington. Impressed, Marshall invited Eisenhower to join his Fort Benning staff; however, Eisenhower declined because of a prior assignment. In late 1941, Marshall needed a new Chief of Operations Division in the War

Department. Eisenhower, now a brigadier general, had performed brilliantly as General Krueger's Third Army Chief of Staff during the 1941 Louisiana maneuvers. This performance, coupled with strong recommendations from Generals Clark and Gerow, convinced Marshall to assign Eisenhower to the position.⁶ A few hours after Eisenhower arrived in Washington, he was seated in front of Marshall who, after describing the tense national and international situation one week after the Pearl Harbor attack, asked, "What should be our general line of action?" Eisenhower satisfactorily answered the question several hours later. Eisenhower recalled, "His tone implied that I had been given the problem as a check to an answer he had already reached."⁷ The initiation phase for Eisenhower had thus started. It would last about six months until his reassignment as the Commanding General, U.S. Forces, European Theater.

Cultivation Phase

The cultivation phase in the Pershing-Marshall mentorship began with Marshall's assignment as Pershing's aide-de-camp and ended with Marshall's reassignment to Tientsin, China, five years later.⁸ The full range of mentoring functions occurred during this period.

The cultivation phase in the Marshall-Eisenhower mentorship is less defined. It began shortly after Eisenhower reported to the War Department in December 1941, thereby merging into the initiation phase. It extended through the separation phase,

which began in June 1942 and lasted until Marshall's retirement as Army Chief of Staff on November 26, 1945.⁹ This period spanned less than four years. This blending of the cultivation phase with both the initiation and separation phases was caused by wartime conditions. However, the mentorship functions that normally occur during the cultivation phase did occur.

Separation Phase

The separation phase in the Pershing-Marshall mentorship lasted 14 years, until Marshall reported back to Washington in June 1938 as a brigadier general. Both men, however, had kept up a lively correspondence and visited each other during the separation. Pershing provided a number of mentoring functions during this period, the most prominent of which was friendship.

The separation phase in the Marshall-Eisenhower mentorship began in June 1942 when Eisenhower left Washington for England and ended when he returned in November 1945 to replace General Marshall as the Army Chief of Staff. This phase overlapped with the cultivation phase. By December 1944, it began merging with the redefinition phase when Eisenhower was promoted to General of the Army four days after Marshall's promotion.

Redefinition Phase

In both cases, the redefinition phase formally began with the protege achieving the position of Army Chief of Staff. The proteges had become "peers" with their respective mentors. One difference is that Eisenhower went on to become President of the

United States thereby achieving a position which surpassed that of his mentor. Although the Marshall-Eisenhower mentorship phases are less distinct, they are discernible through the functions taking place within them.

CAREER FUNCTIONS

Sponsorship

Both mentors actively sponsored their proteges. General Pershing on different occasions sponsored Marshall for promotion to brigadier general. On May 24, 1935, President Franklin D. Roosevelt sent a memorandum to the Secretary of War which stated, "General Pershing asks very strongly that Colonel George C. Marshall (Infantry) be promoted to Brigadier." Marshall was not selected. In a June 10, 1935, letter to Pershing thanking him for his support, Marshall wrote, "I can but wait--grow older--and hope for a more favorable situation in Washington."¹⁰ Pershing tried again by asking John C. O'Laughlin, publisher of the prestigious Army and Navy Journal and well-connected politically, in an August 23, 1935, letter to "put in a good word" for Marshall with the then Chief of Staff Douglas MacArthur. O'Laughlin did talk with MacArthur and wrote back to Pershing that, although MacArthur felt Marshall should wait for the Chief of Infantry job, MacArthur would recommend Marshall for brigadier general on the next list to Secretary of War Dern.¹¹ Pershing's sponsorship helped to eventually produce the desired results. In a May 26, 1936, letter to Marshall, Pershing wrote "I had a

conversation here in Washington after my arrival and found that you are positively and definitely on the slate (brigadier general list) for September." Pershing then recounted how he had tried to have Marshall placed first instead of last on the list of six, but had failed. He closed by observing "I am sure that you are destined to hold a very high place on the list of general officers before you reach the age of sixty-four."¹²

Marshall also actively sponsored Eisenhower in his rapid rise from brigadier general to general of the army in four short years. This sponsorship began when Eisenhower, who was sensitive about not having served in France during World War I, passed yet another of Marshall's tests in March 1942. As Eisenhower recalled,

I was in his office one day and he got on the (subject) of promotions. He said, I want you to know that in this war the commanders are going to be promoted and not the staff officers. After letting go this homily for about two or three minutes, he turned to me and said, You are a good case. General Joyce wanted you for a division commander and the Army commander said you should have corps command. He said, Eisenhower--this was a real loaded brick--you're not going to get any promotion. You are going to stay right here on this job and you'll probably never move.

Finally I said, General, I don't give a damn about your promotion. I was brought in here to do a duty. I am going to do that duty to the best of my ability and I am just trying to do my part in winning the war. And I got up and left. It was a great big test. And for some reason. . .it was just one of those things. . .I happened to turn around and there was a little quirk of a smile (on his face) and I grinned and left.¹³

Marshall nominated Eisenhower for major general in 1942 and, shortly thereafter, selected Eisenhower as the European Theater

Commander.¹⁴ While Eisenhower successfully pursued his increasingly complex and difficult assignments, Marshall sponsored him for the North Africa command and subsequent promotion to general. Marshall's biographer wrote that "Although it was true that Marshall had not (initially) selected Eisenhower in the beginning for the Supreme Commander's post (late 1943), he had certainly put him on the way to that position, and he as much as any other man was responsible for his reaching that goal."¹⁵ Queried by President Roosevelt on what he wanted to do, Marshall refused to ask for the job and the President decided on Eisenhower. Marshall sent his handwritten draft of Eisenhower's appointment, which the President had approved, to Eisenhower as a memento.¹⁶

Exposure and Visibility

Both mentorships were characterized by active exposure-and-visibility. While Marshall was Pershing's aide, Pershing took him on most of his visits to Congress, camps, factories, and cities. During one of the congressional visits in which Pershing testified on Army reorganization, Marshall recalled sitting on one side of him with General Conner on the other and giving advice and suggestions to Pershing as the situation warranted.¹⁷

Similarly, Marshall sent Eisenhower to England several times while he was in War Plans to study and report on the organization needed for the cross-channel invasion. In Marshall's words, "I sent Eisenhower and some others over so the British could have a

look at them . . . and then I asked Churchill what he thought of them. He was extravagant in his estimate of them, so I went ahead with my decision on Eisenhower."¹⁸

Coaching

Coaching was very evident in both mentorships. Pershing coached Marshall in the art of politics and in business. Pershing coached Marshall not only in how to deal effectively with politicians and high-ranking members of the War Department staff, but he also taught Marshall the importance of visiting camps and factories to gain first-hand an idea on how the organizations were functioning.¹⁹

The following illustrates how Marshall coached Eisenhower. Eisenhower recalled his first interview with Marshall in December 1941 as follows,

Eisenhower (said Marshall), the Department is filled with able men who analyze their problems well but feel compelled always to bring them to me for final solution. I must have assistants who will solve their own problems and tell me later what they have done. I resolved then and there, Eisenhower said later, to do my work to the best of my ability and report to the General only situations of obvious necessity or when he personally sent for me.²⁰

Protection

Both Marshall and Eisenhower were protected by their respective mentors. General Pershing sent a letter to President Roosevelt on September 16, 1943, to express his firm conviction that Marshall should remain as the Army Chief of Staff. Pershing wrote, "To transfer him (Marshall) to a tactical command in a

limited area, no matter how seemingly important, is to deprive ourselves of the benefit of his outstanding strategical ability and experience. I know of no one at all comparable to replace him as Chief of Staff."²¹

Marshall was equally protective of Eisenhower. During Operation TORCH, Eisenhower, in an effort to keep the French neutral and with the support of Marshall and the President, negotiated an arrangement to allow Admiral Darlan, Vichy Commander of the French armed forces, to serve as high commissioner in North Africa. Darlan, who had ordered a cease-fire for all French troops on November 10, 1942, was very controversial since he was an official of Vichy France. Marshall fully supported Eisenhower. Marshall assured Eisenhower that he would do his utmost to support him by meeting with the press, with members of Congress, with the State Department, and with the President. Marshall wrote, "Do not worry about this, leave the worries to us and go ahead with your campaign."²²

Challenging Assignments

Challenging assignments were also used by the mentors in both relationships. Pershing would send papers which normally dealt with Marshall's superiors in to Marshall while he was the aide and request his candid opinion.²³ In this way, Pershing groomed Marshall for higher assignments. In the fall of 1923, Pershing left for Europe and spent the next six months in Paris and on the Riviera working on his memoirs and relaxing. Marshall

and Major General John L. Hines, Deputy Chief of Staff, ran the Army during this period. Marshall wrote Pershing weekly to keep him abreast of developments.²⁴

In the case of Eisenhower, his performance as Chief of War Plans, coupled with his passage of Marshall's various "tests," led to his subsequent assignments as Commanding General, European Theater of Operations; Supreme Commander, Allied Expeditionary Force; and ultimately, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army.

PSYCHOSOCIAL FUNCTIONS

Role Modeling

Role modeling was apparent in the Pershing-Marshall mentorship. Marshall viewed Pershing as extremely harsh and stern at work. He was a model of self-discipline and integrity. However, Marshall appreciated Pershing's ability to separate work from leisure time. Marshall noted that during after duty hours Pershing could relax and become quite jovial.²⁵ The most significant impact that Pershing had on Marshall was his ability to accept criticism. Said Marshall:

I have never seen a man who could listen to as much criticism--as long as it was constructive criticism and wasn't just being irritable or something of that sort. You could talk to him like you were discussing somebody in the next country and yet you were talking about him personally . . . you could say what you pleased as long as it was straight, constructive criticism. And yet he did not hold it against you for an instant. I never saw another commander that I could do that with. Their sensitivity clouded them up, so it just wouldn't work. I have seen some I could be very frank with, but I could never be frank to the degree that I could be with General Pershing.²⁶

For Eisenhower, Marshall provided a role model who was devoted to the concept that duty performance, and nothing else, earns rewards. Marshall's feeling on performance and promotion was "if he hadn't delivered, he wouldn't have moved up."²⁷ Eisenhower respected this approach when he corresponded with Marshall regarding officers for promotion. Marshall's protection of and loyalty to Eisenhower also influenced his support of subordinates who were doing a good job. Eisenhower emulated Marshall. Eisenhower wrote at the end of the Casablanca Conference that "(General Marshall) is unquestionably the great military leader of this war, a fact which the world will recognize before this war is over."²⁸

Acceptance and Confirmation

Both mentors were exceptional in performing the acceptance-and-confirmation function with their proteges. Both encouraged the frank exchange of views and ideas without fear of censure. One incident involves the habit mentioned earlier of Pershing's sending papers in to Marshall for his comments. Pershing, in conjunction with General Harbord, wanted to change an action of General March's and asked Marshall for his opinion. Marshall nonconcurred. Pershing called for him and said, "I don't take to this at all--I don't agree with you." Marshall rewrote his nonconcurrence and Pershing called for him again. "I don't accept this," said Pershing. "I think Harbord and I are right." Marshall rewrote his nonconcurrence a third time and took it in

to Pershing who, after reading it, "slapped his hand on the desk, which is something I had never seen him do before, and said, 'No, by God, we will do it this way.'" Marshall replied, "Now General, just because you hate the guts of General March, you're setting yourself up--and General Harbord, who hates him too--to do something you know damn well is wrong." Pershing handed the paper back to Marshall, replying, "Well, have it your own way." Marshall recalled that "General Pershing held no (grudges) at all. He might be very firm at the time, but if you convinced him, that was the end of that. He accepted that and you went ahead."²⁹

Likewise, Marshall encouraged Eisenhower to speak his own mind. In a message sent to Eisenhower prior to Operation TORCH, the invasion of North Africa, Marshall wrote,

When you disagree with my point of view, say so, without an apologetic approach; when you want something that you aren't getting, tell me and I will try to get it for you. I have complete confidence in your management of the affair, and want to support you in every way practicable.³⁰

Counseling

Counseling of Marshall by Pershing was, for the most part, limited to keeping his spirits up regarding promotion to brigadier general. One of a series of letters between the two while Marshall was assigned to Chicago illustrates Marshall's disappointment: "I have possessed myself in patience, but I'm fast getting too old to have any future of importance in the Army."³¹ After Marshall became Chief of Staff, he would either

write or visit Pershing at Walter Reed and receive advice on the conduct of the war and things in general.³²

With Eisenhower, Marshall was concerned about Eisenhower's health and was constantly reminding him to exercise as well as rest. Marshall ordered Eisenhower to return home in December 1943 to rest up prior to becoming the OVERLORD commander.

Marshall wrote,

You will be under terrific strain from now on. I am interested in that you are fully prepared to bear the strain and I am not interested in the usual rejoinder that you can take it. It is of vast importance that you be fresh mentally and you certainly will not be if you go straight from one great problem to another.³³

Friendship

Of the two relationships, only the Pershing-Marshall mentorship was marked to the end by a warm and deep friendship. Marshall thought enough of Pershing to ask him to serve as his best man when he married his second wife, Katherine Tupper Brown, in Baltimore, Maryland, on October 15, 1930.³⁴ The visits between the two, especially when Marshall was Chief of Staff, were cherished by both. In contrast, both Eisenhower and Marshall were friendly and cordial to each other, but they never developed as warm a friendship as the one Marshall enjoyed with Pershing. The fact that Marshall and Eisenhower never worked together in an intimacy shared during the Pershing-Marshall mentorship was a factor. Although true friendship did not develop, both Marshall and Eisenhower had great respect and admiration for each other.

Both relationships were successful, especially since the protege was assisted by his mentor in developing to his full potential and subsequently serving with distinction in a position of great responsibility. All three served as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army. This supports the premise that the goal of a mentor is to help make the Army better by allowing proteges to develop to their full potential.³⁵ Pershing's mentorship of Marshall comes the closest to the "traditional" model. The full range of mentorship functions occurred throughout distinct mentorship phases. The Marshall-Eisenhower relationship was not as well defined in that the cultivation and separation phases were merged into one due to wartime requirements. Although some functions were more strongly marked than others, the relationship included all of the mentoring functions.

ENDNOTES

1. Stephen E. Wilson, LTC, Senior Leader Mentorship, p. 11.
2. Harrold E. Raugh, Jr., "Pershing and Marshall: A Study in Mentorship," Army, June 1987, pp. 55-56.
3. Forrest C. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Ordeal and Hope, 1939-1942, p. 327.
4. Raugh, pp. 52-53.
5. Ibid., pp. 53-55.
6. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Ordeal and Hope, 1939-1942, p. 237.
7. Ibid., pp. 238-239.
8. Forrest C. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Education of a General, 1880-1939, p. 228.
9. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Ordeal and Hope, 1939-1942, p. 340.
10. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Education of a General, 1880-1939, p. 295.
11. Ibid., pp. 295-298.
12. Ibid., p. 298.
13. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Ordeal and Hope, 1939-1942, p. 338.
14. Ibid., p. 340.
15. Forrest C. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Organizer of Victory, 1943-1945, p. 322.
16. Ibid.
17. Raugh, p. 55.
18. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Ordeal and Hope, 1939-1942, p. 339.
19. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Education of a General, 1880-1939, p. 223.

20. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Ordeal and Hope, 1939-1942, p. 337.
21. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Organizer of Victory, 1943-1945, p. 272.
22. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Ordeal and Hope, 1939-1942, p. 420.
23. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Education of a General, 1880-1939, p. 218.
24. Raugh, p. 56.
25. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Education of a General, 1880-1939, p. 225.
26. Larry I. Bland and Sharon R. Ritenour, eds. The Papers of George Catlett Marshall, Vol. 1: "The Soldierly Spirit" December 1880-June 1939, p. 189.
27. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Ordeal and Hope, 1939-1942, p. 338.
28. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Organizer of Victory, 1943-1945, p. 36.
29. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Education of a General, 1880-1939, pp. 225-226.
30. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Ordeal and Hope, 1939-1942, p. 411.
31. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Education of a General, 1880-1939, p. 297.
32. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Ordeal and Hope, 1939-1942, p. 238.
33. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Organizer of Victory, 1943-1945, p. 326.
34. Pogue, George C. Marshall: Education of a General, 1880-1939, p. 267.
35. James O. Patterson, "Defining Mentorship," Armor, November-December 1985, p. 38.

CHAPTER VI

MILITARY STUDIES ON MENTORING

The military has conducted seven studies in the area of mentoring. Three of the studies were conducted by Air Force officers, one by an Army officer, two by the US Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, and one by a study group appointed by the Army Chief of Staff.

Captain Michael E. Uecker, conducted the first study, Mentoring and Leadership Development in the Officer Corps of the USAF (1984). This study surveyed a sampling of Air Force officers to determine the prevalence of mentoring among high potential officers and the effects of mentoring on them.¹ The participants of the study were students attending the USAF Air Command and Staff College (ACSC) and the USAF Air War College (AWC).

Uecker reported that approximately half of the respondents had experienced a mentoring relationship. He found that officers with mentors were more likely to be promoted ahead of contemporaries, were extremely satisfied with their career progression, and were more satisfied with their jobs.²

Uecker concluded that mentoring appeared to be an informal leadership development tool which was prevalent to the same degree in every major command. Also, the most important roles played by the mentor, as perceived by the protege, were those of role model and teacher. Unfortunately, those respondents who

reported not having a mentor perceived the relationship as a method of getting ahead with the help of a sponsor or protector.³

The second study, Air Force Mentoring: The Mentor's Perspective (1985) by Captain Francis Lewandowski, researched mentoring from the mentor's perspective. Lewandowski's study found that nearly two-thirds of those surveyed (112 Air War College designees) reported having had a mentoring relationship at some point in their career.⁴ This study reported a different finding from what Uecker reported with regard to mentored officers and faster promotions. It found that mentored officers were not more likely to be promoted ahead of unmentored counterparts.⁵

Proteges reported that their mentors had a profound effect on their careers. Lewandowski also found that from the protege's perspective the most important roles played were role modeling and sponsoring. However, just as Uecker, Lewandowski found that those without a mentor perceived the phenomenon to be negative.⁶ He did conclude that mentoring played an important role in the leadership development of officers.⁷

The third study, Air Force Mentoring: The Potential Protege's Perspective (1986) by Captain Jeffry A. Gouge, surveyed the potential protege's perceptions of mentoring. Gouge's sample consisted of officers (potential proteges) attending the Aircraft Maintenance Course (AMC) at Chanute AFB, Illinois. This study included the participants' expectations for gaining a mentor, perceived roles and functions of a mentor, expected outcomes of

the process, and various demographic factors relevant to the process.⁸

An analysis of the data revealed a substantial interest in mentoring relationships and highlighted the positive expectations of the phenomenon. But participants perceived their abilities to complete assignments, to lead, and to motivate as more important to career success than having a mentor.⁹

Gouge found that if a person entered the Air Force officer corps having had previous experience with mentors, the individual would seek a mentor again. Gouge stated that

The potential protege sees the mentor as a role model and guide to help him learn the ropes but realizes that to achieve a successful career he must be a competent leader. Neither gender nor commissioning source appears to be of importance in selection of the mentor. The potential protege expects the mentor to share his knowledge of people and things and to possess integrity. In return, he anticipates helping his mentor achieve job satisfaction.¹⁰

He concluded that mentoring appeared to be a resource development tool for senior officers to help junior officers learn their professions.¹¹

The fourth study, The Professional Development of Officers Study (PDOS) (1985), was an Army Chief of Staff directed study. Under the directorship of Lieutenant General Charles W. Bagnal, the study group was tasked to look at the entire Army and to make recommendations for officer professional development out to year 2025. It was the first detailed Army study that addressed mentoring as a tool for improving the leadership and professional development of officers.

All aspects of officer professional development were examined by the study. The PDOS included a review of officer professional development not only through education and training, but also through socialization within the Army. This study collected data from over 14,000 officers, including more than half of the serving general officers. As a result of its many and varied findings, the "professional development framework" was designed which depicted professional development occurring throughout an officer's career in both peace and war.¹²

Mentoring was one of the many issues addressed in the study. Eighty-eight percent of those surveyed agreed that the officer should first be a mentor and a role model and that commanders should be evaluated on the extent to which they develop the officers serving under them. Correspondingly, general officers felt that the professional development of subordinates was just as much a leader's responsibility as accomplishing an organizational mission. However, 59 percent of the participants perceived themselves as not having a mentor.¹³

The study group designed the "mentor-based strategy" as part of PDOS professional development framework. The new strategy was designed to improve the leadership and professional development of officers. The strategy emphasized the leaders' use of mentorship roles in educating and training officers in the professional schools and units.¹⁴

The study group defined the term mentor as "a leader involved in developing (through education, socializing and

training) an individual by being for that individual a role model, teacher, coach, advisor and guide. A school faculty mentor has the additional responsibilities of writing doctrine and developing courses and courseware."¹⁵ Mentorship was the desired style of leadership in the Army for the overall officer professional development.¹⁶ The mentor was therefore perceived as a leader who uses a mentorship style of leadership in developing subordinates. A mentorship style of leadership "is characterized by open communication with subordinates, role modeling of appropriate values, effective use of counseling for subordinate development, and sharing of the leader's frame of reference with subordinate leaders."¹⁷

The fifth study, Leader Development Training Assessment of U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Brigade Commanders (1986) by Stephen R. Stewart and Jack M. Hicks, documented the results of a leader development course conducted by the Training and Doctrine Command for twenty-five TRADOC brigade commanders. Findings indicated that mentoring as a methodology for developing human resource potential within the Army, was not well understood. Many variations existed on what the concept meant and on how to implement it.¹⁸

All commanders were asked about mentoring, the extent they used it and for what purposes, the extent to which they were currently mentored, and whether or not they have been mentored in the past.¹⁹

The study revealed a pronounced degree of confusion about the concept of mentoring. To some it consisted of counseling sessions that go along with or were a part of the formal officer evaluation process. To others it meant providing the political connections that were sometimes thought to either assure rapid promotion at a given point in time or to secure the positions or assignments that would lead to rapid advancement in the future. This latter view was the most prevalent. For some, mentoring consisted of "sessions" that were convened periodically for the purpose of teaching or counseling.²⁰

Most of the commanders stated they had been mentored in the past. A substantial number of them had had more than one mentor. All but one, however, felt they were not currently being mentored.

The sixth study, Mentoring: Its Effect on Black Officers' Career Progression Within the US Army (1988) by Major E. James Mason, investigated the mentoring experiences of black and white senior Army officers. It examined the effects of mentoring on their careers within the US Army. It also examined their perceptions of the role of mentors.²¹ According to the author, since these officers have reached positions of trust and responsibility, their perceptions were the most credible possible.²² Mason's sample consisted of 144 senior officers from the rank of lieutenant colonel through lieutenant general. Fifty-eight of these senior officers reported having had a mentor at one point or another in their career. Of those, more than

half reported that their mentor influenced their career progression from a great to a very great extent.²³

Based on the research, senior officers perceived mentors to be important contributors to protege's job satisfaction, to his ability to maintain technical skills associated with his job, to his ability to better understand professional affairs and for his overall success in the organization.²⁴ It appeared that this attention to junior officers by mentors was to insure that the proteges would realize their full potential and that they were beneficial to the Army. The following comment is from a senior officer who seemed to understand the mentoring phenomenon:

The ability to mentor is a quality not possessed by all. It is not a task that can be directed with guaranteed success. There has to be a desire to serve and an appreciation of the other person. Mentoring for the purpose of promotion should not be the goal, but to give the individual the opportunity 'to be all that he/she can be', to perform up to their potential.²⁵

Other general conclusions were that senior Army officers had healthy attitudes toward the concept of mentoring. Moreover, they believed that mentoring was a tool that helped improve junior officers' job satisfaction and success in the organization, all for the betterment of the Army.

Senior Army officers perceived that the critical roles of a mentor were that of a role model, counselor and teacher. The majority of the senior officers perceived the roles of a protector and sponsor as less important. One senior officer wrote:

I believe one of the most sacred roles of the counselor, mentor, etc, is to keep the officers out of harm's way to the extent that he/she can, and to intervene on the officers' behalf when fundamental fairness is not being properly dispensed by the organization or an individual in the organization.

Protecting the officer during risk taking is important, but not nearly as important as intervening on behalf of the officer when fairness is not being dispensed in accordance with the officer's competence and demonstrated ability.²⁶

Senior officers viewed mentoring as more than education and leadership. They supported the idea that mentoring is an informal relationship between professionals. Conducted in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect, mentoring allows senior officers the opportunity to share experiences, knowledge and challenges with selected junior officers with the goal of improving the Army through the proteges' growing maturity and the development of their full potential.²⁷

The seventh study, 1988 Survey: Longitudinal Research on Officer Careers (1988), was conducted by the U.S. Army Research Institute (ARI). It focuses on issues pertaining to Army officers' careers and their families. The survey included over five thousand Army officers from second lieutenant to major and above.

Within career issues were some questions which addressed the subject of mentoring. Eighty percent responded that they had had at least one mentor in their career. Fifty-three percent indicated that their mentor was in the rating chain, and seventeen percent indicated that their mentor was outside their

chain of command. The results showed that forty percent felt that job-related help was the most important service provided to them by their mentor. Twenty-eight percent felt that career planning help was most important, followed by eight percent that felt personal-social help was most important. Finally, only five percent felt that the most important help provided was moral-ethical.²⁸

These seven studies show that, in general, the Army officers' perception of mentoring are in concert with the "traditional" definition of mentoring. However, there is a sufficiently wide variation in the understanding of mentoring and how to implement it, to conclude that the concept is not translated into practice with consistency throughout the Army.

ENDNOTES

1. Michael E. Uecker, CPT, Mentoring and Leadership Development in the Officer Corps of the United States Air Force, p. v.
2. Ibid., p. 50.
3. Ibid., pp. 36-50.
4. Francis Lewandowski, CPT, Air Force Mentoring: The Mentor's Perspective, p. v.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid., pp. 38-45.
7. Ibid., p. 66
8. Jeffrey A. Gouge, CPT, Air Force Mentoring: The Potential Protege's Perspective, p. vi.
9. Ibid., p. 63.
10. Ibid., p. 66.
11. Ibid., p. 21.
12. United States, Department of the Army, Results of the Professional Development of Officers Study (PDOS) Group Report, p. 52.
13. Ibid., p. 53.
14. Ibid., p. 54.
15. Ibid., p. C-4.
16. Ibid., p. 5.
17. John C. Krysa, "Mentoring--More Than Just Another Trendy Concept," Field Artillery Journal, November-December 1985, p. 16.
18. Stephen R. Stewart and Jack M. Hicks, Leader Development Training Assessment of U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Brigade Commanders, p. vii.
19. Ibid., p. 10.
20. Ibid., p. 11.

21. E. James Mason, MAJ, Mentoring: Its Effect on Black Officers' Career Progression Within the U.S. Army, p. 89.

22. Ibid., p. 29.

23. Ibid., p. 96.

24. Ibid., p. 93.

25. Ibid.

26. Ibid., p. 97.

27. Ibid., p. 96.

28. United States Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI), 1988 Survey: Longitudinal Research on Officer Careers, p. 10.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY

This paper has provided insights into the mentoring process and delineated how mentoring is currently being practiced throughout the Army. Now it is time to assess the value of retaining mentoring as a primary concept in the professional development of future Army leaders.

FINDINGS

An in-depth survey of the military and civilian literature on mentoring and a careful analysis of the studies on mentoring in the military support the generally accepted view that the primary purpose of mentoring is to develop future leaders.

The literature reflects that the Army's perceptions of mentoring are, for the most part, in concert with the various theories, ideas and opinions of the civilian academic community. In spite of the range of findings and differing labels, most of the research could be assembled into a fairly cohesive construct of mentoring. This construct, known as the "traditional" concept, divides the mentoring functions into two groups, career and psychosocial, while describing the entire relationship over time in four phases.

The mentor-protégé relationship has the potential to enhance career development and psychosocial development. Through career functions--including sponsorship, coaching, protection, exposure

and visibility, and challenging work assignments--a protege is assisted in learning the informal rules and culture of the organization and in preparing for advancement opportunities. Through psychosocial functions--including role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship--a protege is supported in developing a sense of competence, confidence and effectiveness as a leader and manager.

The roles or functions performed by the mentor change as the needs of the protege change. Furthermore, organizational and psychological factors tend to influence which career and psychosocial functions are provided during the different phases of the mentor-protege relationship. These relationships vary in length. They generally proceed through four predictable phases, although they are not always distinct. The initiation phase allows the relationship to get started. The cultivation phase triggers an entire range of functions, which may expand and flourish. The separation phase provides for substantial alteration of the relationship, perhaps terminating it. The redefinition phase is the time during which the relationship evolves into a significantly different form or ends entirely.

The utility of the concept of mentoring was illustrated by using it to analyze two generally accepted successful mentor-protege relationships, Generals Pershing-Marshall and Generals Marshall-Eisenhower. The two mentorships were clearly successful. They led to a better Army through the mentor helping the protege reach his full potential.

The results of the military studies on mentoring revealed that the majority of officers throughout the Army include both career functions and psychosocial functions in their understanding of the concept of mentoring. Not all the functions of either group were included. Further, among the studies were several discrepancies about which functions were most important. The functions being currently practiced include role modeling, teaching, advising, sponsoring, counseling, guiding, motivating and protecting.

Among all the studies, although longevity could only be inferred, there was little evidence of long-term relationships extending over several phases. The general consensus was that the mentoring relationship extended over the period in which the mentor and protege were assigned together. Upon reassignment, the protege would look for a new mentor.

CONCLUSION

Mentoring as a methodology for the development of the human resources potential within the Army is a poorly understood concept. It is evident that the Army greatly misconceives the mentoring process as a whole. The phenomenon of mentoring is not clearly conceptualized; this leads to confusion about just what it is, what it does, and how the process works. Mentoring appears to mean one thing to some, another thing to others, and a third thing to still others. The functions currently being practiced--teaching, sponsoring, counseling, role modeling,

coaching, protecting--are not mentoring as defined by the "traditional" concept. Rather, they designate only some of many functions practiced by the mentor. These functions, which are practiced outside the commitment to a long-term relationship, are simply characteristics required of good leadership.

The Pershing-Marshall and Marshall-Eisenhower mentorships demonstrate that there existed a special professional relationship which exhibited most of the characteristics of the "traditional" model of mentoring. Both relationships were idiosyncratic; they were not products of a formalized mentoring program. Both relationships were strictly voluntary, they were not mandated. Each relationship was initiated because of a mutual need and desire. Each relationship developed according to individual leadership styles. The success of both mentor-protege relationships were due to the exceptional ability, self-confidence, commitment, dedication and experience of the mentor and the uniquely great potential of the protege. It follows then that "traditional" mentoring is available and applicable to only a very select few. Further, it cannot be mandated, it must be voluntary.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Although the concept of mentoring is valuable from an academic perspective, the utility of "traditional" mentoring has limited value in the Army. We have those rare individuals, in extremely special circumstances, who may benefit from a

"traditional" mentor-protege relationship. True mentorship has identified great leaders early and allowed them to train early for the highest positions and greatest responsibilities, such as we see in the careers of Pershing, Marshall and Eisenhower. However, the vast majority of Army officers will not qualify for, nor will they benefit from such a mentorship. Therefore, mandated, formal mentoring programs should not be established. Furthermore, the Army should eliminate mentoring as a primary concept in the doctrine for development of future leaders. Instead, only those limited functions of a mentor--role modeling, coaching, teaching, advising, sponsoring, counseling, guiding, motivating and protecting--which are currently being practiced by Army officers and which are the same required for good leadership, should be included in Army doctrine for leader development. However, we should encourage "traditional" mentoring by establishing a favorable climate where mentor-protege relationships can develop between those few exceptional individuals. As a result of implementing these recommendations we will eliminate confusion regarding a vaguely perceived topic. Further, we will share clearer, more communicable and valid information in our leader professional development programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bagnal, Charles W.; Pence, Earl C.; and Meriwether, Thomas N. "Leaders as Mentors." Military Review, Vol. 65, July 1985, pp. 4-20.
2. Baucom, Donald R. "The Air Force Officer Corps in the 1980's." Air University Review, Vol. 34, September-October 1983, pp. 50-54.
3. Berry, Patricia. "Mentors for Women Managers: Fast-track to Corporate Success?" Supervisory Management, Vol. 28, August 1983, pp. 36-40.
4. Bland, Larry I. and Ritenour, Sharon R., eds. The Papers of George Catlett Marshall, Vol. 1: "The Soldierly Spirit" December 1880 - June 1939. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981.
5. Bland, Larry I.; Ritenour, Sharon R.; and Wunderlin, Clarence E. Jr., eds. The Papers of George Catlett Marshall, Vol. 2: "We Cannot Delay" July 1, 1939 - December 6, 1941. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.
6. Brown, Robert D. and DeCoster, David A., eds. Mentoring--Transcript Systems for Promoting Student Growth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.
7. Bushardt, Stephen C., et al. "Picking the Right Person for Your Mentor." Advanced Management Journal, Vol. 47, Summer 1982, pp. 46-51.
8. Clawson, James G. "Is Mentoring Necessary?" Training and Development Journal, Vol. 39, April 1985, pp. 36-39.
9. Collins, Eliza G. and Scott, Patricia, eds. "Everyone Who Makes it Has a Mentor." Harvard Business Review, Vol. 56, July-August 1978, pp. 89-101.
10. Cook, M. F. "Is the Mentor Relationship Primarily a Male Experience?" Personnel Administrator, Vol. 8, October 1979, pp. 37-42.
11. Daloz, Laurent A. Effective Teaching and Mentoring. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986.
12. Dalton, Gene W.; Thompson, Paul H.; and Price, Raymond L. "The four stages of professional careers--a new look at performance by professionals." Organizational Dynamics, Vol. 6, Summer 1977, pp. 19-42.

13. Dilla, Benjamin L. "Mentoring: Cause and Effect of Good Leadership." Proceedings of the Association of Human Resource Management and Organizational Behavior, N.p: 1985, pp. 630-635.
14. Erickson, E. H. Childhood and Society. 2d ed. New York: Horton, 1963.
15. Ewing, L. M. "Mentoring: Much More than a Senior-Junior Relationship." ARMY, Vol. 36, September 1986, pp. 20-23.
16. Farren, Caela; Gray, Janet Dreyfus; and Kaye, Beverly. "Mentoring: A Boon to Career Development." Personnel, Vol. 61, November-December 1984, pp. 20-24.
17. Fitt, Lawton W. and Newton, Derek A. "When the Mentor is a Man and the Protege a Woman." Harvard Business Review, Vol. 59, March-April 1981, pp. 56-60.
18. Forsythe, George B., et al. "Framework for Leader Development." Military Review, Vol. 68, November 1988, pp. 17-27.
19. Gouge, Jeffrey A., CPT. Air Force Mentoring: The Potential Protege's Perspective. Thesis. Wright-Patterson AFB: School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), September 1986.
20. Gray, William A. and Gray, Marilynne Miles, eds. "Mentoring" A Comprehensive Annotated Bibliography of Important References. Vancouver: International Association for Mentoring, 1986.
21. Gray, William A. and Gray, Marilynne Miles, eds. Mentoring: Aid to Excellence in Education, the Family and the Community, Vol I: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Mentoring. Vancouver: International Association for Mentoring, 1986.
22. Gray, William A. and Gray, Marilynne Miles, eds. Mentoring: Aid to Excellence in Career Development, Business and the Professions, Vol II: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Mentoring. Vancouver: International Association for Mentoring, 1986.
23. Gray, William A. and Gray, Marilynne Miles, eds. Mentoring: Aid to Excellence in Career Development, Business and the Professions, Vol II: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Mentoring. Vancouver: International Association for Mentoring, 1986. Pp. 8-14: "Formal vs. Informal Mentoring: Towards a Framework," by David M. Hunt.

24. Gray, William A. and Gray, Marilynne Miles, eds. Mentoring: Aid to Excellence in Career Development, Business and the Professions, Vol II: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Mentoring. Vancouver: International Association for Mentoring, 1986. Pp.44-51: "Measuring Mentoring--Frequency, Quality, Impact," by Elizabeth Alleman.
25. Halatin, Theodore J. "Why Be a Mentor?" Supervisory Management, Vol. 26, February 1981, pp. 36-39.
26. Halatin, Theodore J. and Knotts, Rose E. "Becoming A Mentor: Are the Risks Worth the Rewards?" Supervisory Management, Vol. 27, February 1982, pp. 27-29.
27. Hennecke, Matthew J. "Mentors and Proteges: How to Build Relationships that Work." Training, Vol. 20, July 1983, pp. 279-282.
28. Hunt, David M. and Michael, Carol. "Mentorship: A Career Training and Development Tool." Academy of Management Review, Vol. 8, July 1983, pp. 475-485.
29. Hurley, Dan. "The Mentor Mystique." Psychology Today, Vol. 22, May 1988, pp. 38-43.
30. Ingraham, Larry H. "Caring Is Not Enough: An Uninvited Talk to Army Leaders." Military Review, Vol. 67, December 1987, pp. 45-48.
31. Johnson, Julie. "Mentors Help to Shape General Powell's Career." New York Times, 16 September 1988, p. A20.
32. Johnson, Mary C. "Mentors--The Key to Growth and Development." Training and Development Journal, Vol. 34, July 1980, pp. 40-43.
33. Jolemore, Kenneth A. "The Mentor: More Than a Teacher, More Than a Coach." Military Review, Vol. 66, July 1986, pp. 5-17.
34. Klauss, Rudi. "Formalized Mentor Relationships for Management and Executive Development Programs in the Federal Government." Public Administration Review, Vol. 41, July-August 1981, pp. 489-496.
35. Knowles, Asa S., ed. The International Encyclopedia of Higher Education. Vol. I. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
36. Kotz, Nick; Nathan, Nancy B; and Donohoe, Cathryn. "Where Have All the Warriors Gone?" Washingtonian, July 1984, pp. 169-181.

37. Kram, Kathy E. Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1985.
38. Kram, Kathy E. "Phases of the Mentor Relationship." Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 26, December 1983, pp. 608-625.
39. Kram, Kathy E. "Improving the Mentoring Process." Training and Development Journal, Vol. 39, April 1985, pp. 40-43.
40. Krysa, John C. "Mentoring--More Than Just Another Trendy Concept." Field Artillery Journal, Vol. 53, November-December 1985, pp. 16-17.
41. Kubler, Phillip A. and Davis, Reed E., Jr. "Analyst Mentorship - A Capability Multiplier." Phalanx, Vol. 21, September 1988, pp. 8-9.
42. Lea, Daniel and Leibowitz, Zandy B. "A Mentor: Would You Know One If You Saw One?" Supervisory Management, Vol. 28, April 1983, pp. 32-35.
43. Levinson, Daniel J., et al. The Seasons of a Man's Life. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1978.
44. Lewandowski, Francis, CPT. Air Force Mentoring: The Mentor's Perspective. Thesis. Wright-Patterson AFB: School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), September 1985.
45. Lindholm, Jeann. "Mentoring: The Mentor's Perspective." Interim Technical Report, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1982.
46. Mason, E. James, MAJ. Mentoring: Its Effect on Black Officers' Career Progression within the US Army. Thesis. Fort Leavenworth: US Army Command and General Staff College, June 1989.
47. McClelland, David C. and Burnham, David H. "Power is the Great Motivator." Harvard Business Review, Vol. 54, March-April 1976, pp. 100-110.
48. Merriam, Sharan. "Mentors and Proteges: A Critical Review of the Literature." Adult Education Quarterly, Vol. 33, Spring 1983, pp. 161-173.
49. Myers, Donald W. and Humphreys, Neil J. "Caveats in Mentorship." Business Horizons, Vol. 28, July-August 1984, pp. 9-14.

50. Nadler, David A., and Tushman, Michael L. "What makes for Magic Leadership." Fortune, Vol. 117, June 1988, pp. 261-262.
51. Noller, Ruth B. Mentoring: A Voiced Scarf. Buffalo: Bearly Limited, 1982.
52. Noller, Ruth B. and Frey, Barbara R. Mentoring an Annotated Bibliography. Buffalo: Bearly Limited, 1983.
53. Patterson, James O. "Defining Mentorship." Armor, Vol. 94, November-December 1985, pp. 35-38.
54. Phillips-Jones, Linda. Mentors and Proteges. New York: Arbor House, 1982.
55. Phillips-Jones, Linda. "Establishing a Formalized Mentoring Program." Training and Development Journal, Vol. 37, February 1983, pp. 38-42.
56. Pogue, Forrest C. George C. Marshall: Education of a General, 1880-1939. New York: Viking Press, 1963.
57. Pogue, Forrest C. George C. Marshall: Ordeal and Hope, 1939-1942. New York: Viking Press, 1966.
58. Pogue, Forrest C. George C. Marshall: Organizer of Victory, 1943-1945. New York: Viking Press, 1973.
59. Puryear, Edgar F., Jr. Nineteen Stars. Washington: Coiner Publications, 1971.
60. Ragins, Belle Rose. "Barriers to Mentoring: The Female Manager's Dilemma." Human Relations, Vol. 42, 1989, pp. 1-22.
61. Raugh, Harrold E. Jr. "Pershing and Marshal: A Study in Mentorship." ARMY, Vol. 37, June 1987, pp. 52-63.
62. Reich, Murray H. "Executive Views from Both Sides of Mentoring." Personnel, Vol. 62, March 1985, pp. 42-46.
63. Reich, Murray H. "The Mentor Connection." Personnel, Vol. 63, February 1986, pp. 50-56.
64. Roche, Gerald R. "Much Ado About Mentors." Harvard Business Review, Vol. 57, January-February 1979, pp. 14-28.
65. Schein, E. Career Dynamics: Matching Individual and Organizational Needs. Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1978.

66. Secrist, G. E. "Defective Leadership: America's Greatest Peril." Air University Review, Vol. 34, September-October 1983, pp. 12-19.

67. Shapiro, Eileen C.; Haseltine, Florence P.; and Rowe, Mary P. "Moving Up: Role Models, Mentors, and the 'Patron System.'" Sloan Management Review, Vol. 19, Spring 1978, pp. 51-58.

68. Shea, F. Gordon. Mentors and Mentoring: A Guide for Your Personal Growth in the Organization. N.p.: Wiley, John & Son, 1988.

69. Sorley, Lewis. "In Search of a Mentor." Military Review, Vol. 68, August 1988, pp. 70-79.

70. Stewart, Steven R. and Hicks, Jack M. Leader Development Training Assessment of U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Brigade Commanders. Alexandria: United States Army Research Institute For The Behavioral And Social Sciences (ARI), 1987.

71. Szilagyi, A. D., Jr. Management and Performance. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1984.

72. Uecker, Michael E., CPT. Mentoring and Leadership Development in the Officer Corps of the United States Air Force. Thesis. Wright-Patterson AFB: School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), September 1984.

73. United States. Department of the Army. Field Circular 21-451: I Am The American Soldier. Fort Benjamin Harrison: US Army Soldier Support Center, 1986.

74. United States. Department of the Army. Field Manual 22-100: Military Leadership. Washington: GPO, 1983.

75. United States. Department of the Army. Field Manual 22-103: Leadership and Command at Senior Levels. Washington: GPO, 1987.

76. United States. Department of the Army. Field Manual 100-5: Operations. Washington: GPO, 1986.

77. United States. Department of the Army. Pamphlet 600-50: Leadership Makes the Difference. Washington: GPO, 1985.

78. United States. Department of the Army. Pamphlet 600-80: Executive Leadership. Washington: GPO, 1987.

79. United States. Department of the Army. Results of the Professional Development of Officers Study (PDOS) Group Report. Washington: GPO, February 1985.
80. United States Army Combined Arms Center. Officer Advanced Course Leadership Core Curriculum. Ft. Leavenworth: August 1984.
81. United States Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI). 1988 Survey: Longitudinal Research on Officer Careers. Alexandria: 1988.
82. United States Military Academy. Military Leadership Course Guide AY 1990. West Point: 1990.
83. Wickham, John A., Jr., General. Chief of Staff, U.S. Army. Letter to the Army's General Officers. 8 November 1985.
84. Wickham, John A., Jr., General. "Mentoring." Soldiers, Vol. 41, January 1986, p. 2.
85. Wickham, John A., Jr., General. Collected Works of the Thirtieth Chief of Staff, United States Army. N.p.: n.p., 1987.
86. Wilson, Stephen E., LTC. Senior Leader Mentorship. Thesis. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 31 March 1989.
87. Woodlands Group. "Management Development Roles: Coach, Sponsor and Mentor." Personnel Journal, Vol. 59, November 1980, pp. 918-921.
88. Zaleznik, A. "Managers and leaders: Are they different?" Harvard Business Review, Vol. 55, May-June 1977, pp. 67-78.
89. Zemke, Ron. "The Honeywell Studies How Managers Learn to Manage." Training, Vol. 22, August 1985, pp. 46-51.
90. Zey, Michael G. "A Mentor For All." Personnel Journal, Vol. 67, January 1988, pp. 46-51.
91. Zey, Michael G. The Mentor Connection. Homewood: Dow Jones-Irwin, 1984.
92. Zey, Michael G. "Mentor Programs, Making the Right Moves." Personnel Journal, Vol. 10, February 1985, pp. 53-57.